

Applicant: Thomas GOERING
Serial No. 10/665,258
Response to Final Office Action mailed July 11, 2008

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claim 15 has been withdrawn. Claims 1-14 and 16 have been rejected. Claims 1, 5, and 9 are amended. In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, the applicants request allowance of the application.

INTERVIEW OF AUGUST 14, 2008

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during an interview of August 14, 2008. Applicant's representative stated that the Final Office Action not addressing all the claim limitations of claims 1, 5, and 9. The Examiner stated that he issue an interview summary stating that he would examine the amended claims and issue a new final office action or an allowance.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

The amendments to the claims add no new matter. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 5, and 9 can be found at least at FIG. 3 and ¶ 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Although Applicant disagrees, the claims have been amended in order to further prosecution.

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claims 1-8 and 16 Define over the Cited Art

Claims 1-8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ries et al. ("Ries" US 2004/0217985) in view of Phillips (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,121) (hereinafter "Phillips"), in further view or Rivera et al. ("Rivera" US 2004/0003353). Applicants traverse the rejections.

Claims 1-4

Consider a first portion of claim 1, which recites in part:

the access manager component configured **to retrieve the authorization rules associated with the user's authorization to develop the set of form elements using the user identification**, and configured to enable

access to the user for developing the form elements according to the authorization rules

The Office Action states that this first portion is disclosed by Ries at ¶ 73. Office Action, p. 4. But in Ries, rules are not retrieved using the user identification, and the system of Ries cannot determine whether a user has access rights to an element until the user has decided where to place the element. See Ries at ¶ 72, ll. 5-7, "a hook is created to identify an editable portion of the webpage." And see, Ries at FIGS. 7 & 8, which illustrates that the hooks are stored/retrieved with the webpage and then parsed out of the webpage. The limitations of Ries only permit access rights to be defined according to a single partition of a webpage into geographic areas and the limitations only permit rules to be retrieved based on the geographic areas. ¶¶ 57, 73.

The present invention has at least the advantage that a user could be given access to a form element such as an address field and then place the address field in any geographic area of the form. In Ries, a user would have to be given access to the specific geographic area where the user would like to place the address field in order to be able to edit the address field. Ries, ¶¶ 57, 73. And the system of Ries would not be able to determine whether the user could place the address field until the user had decided on where in the webpage the user was going to place the address field. ¶¶ 57, 73. And because there can be only one partition of the webpage, the system of Ries could not have separate partitions of the webpage for different users, which places geographic limitations on defining rules for users. ¶¶ 57, 73. Additionally, the advanced editing functions of Ries cited by the Office allow only that a user may be given access to all hooks of a particular type so that the advanced editing functions are still based on the geographical area of the webpage. Ries, ¶ 73.

None of the other cited prior art remedy the deficiencies of Ries. Phillips is generally directed towards detecting forks within data flow diagrams and has no authorization rules. Rivera discloses permission rights to a digital form, but the form is not under development, and the rights are for whether a user can change values for fields of the form or view parts of the form. Therefore, none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the first portion of claim 1 recited above.

Moreover, consider a second portion of claim 1, which recites in part:

the form elements including an element for global attributes of the form including the layout of the form

The Office Action states that this second portion is disclosed by FIG. 4B of Phillips. (Office Action, Page 4). But, FIG. 4B does not disclose or suggest at least the layout of the form as a form element. The form is displayed in the top right hand portion of FIG. 4B, but this appears to be for selecting the file that contains the form. In FIG. 4B there is also a section entitled "Properties" but there is no indication that the entire form can be selected and no indication that the layout of the form is a property of the form.

The invention of claim 1 has at least the advantage of being able to include the form layout in the authorization rules. Consider ¶ 30 of the Pending Application, which describes how a form could be developed by multiple departments of an organization. In the example, only the "Corporate Identity" department is given permission to change the form layout and the text styles of the form. Pending Application, ¶ 30, ll. 19-21. It would not be possible to develop the form using multiple departments as described in ¶ 30 without the form elements including global attributes and the layout of the form. The disclosure of Phillips would not permit form development as described in ¶ 30 of the Pending Application. None of the other cited prior art remedy the deficiencies of Phillips. Therefore, none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the second portion of claim 1 recited above.

For at least the reasons stated above none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the elements recited in claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4 is requested.

Claims 5-8

Consider a first portion of claim 5, which recites in part:

retrieving authorization rules associated with the user's authorization to develop the set of form elements, using the user identification

As stated above for claim 1, none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the first portion of claim 5.

Moreover, consider a second portion of claim 5, which recites in part:

the form elements including an element for global attributes of the form including the layout of the form

As stated above for claim 1, none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the second portion of claim 5 recited above.

For at least the reasons stated above none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the elements of claim 5. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5 and therefore include all of the elements recited in claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 5-8 is requested.

Claim 16 Defines Additional Elements over the Cited Art

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ries et al. ("Ries" US 2004/0217985) in view of Phillips (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,121) (hereinafter "Phillips"), in further view or Rivera et al. ("Rivera" US 2004/0003353). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Consider a portion of claim 16, which recites in part:

wherein the form building application is configured **to display only the set of form elements that the user is authorized to modify**

The bolded portion is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art. The Office states that the bolded portion is disclosed by Ries at ¶¶ 59-60. But, the cited portion of Ries only discusses retrieving data based on global configuration data. This does not disclose "**to display only the set of form elements that the user is authorized to modify**." For at least the reasons stated above and stated for claim 1, since claim 16 depends from claim 1), none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the elements of claim 16.

Claims 9-14 Define over the Cited Art

Claims 9-13

Claims 9-13 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menninger (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0048301) (hereinafter ("Menninger") in view of Ries, in view of Phillips (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,121) (hereinafter "Phillips"), in view of Rivera. Applicant traverses the rejections.

Consider a first portion of claim 9, which recites in part:

A computer-implemented method for customizing an electronic form including form elements **under development** •••

The Office Action states that this first portion is disclosed by Menninger at Page 81, ¶ 1858. (Office Action, page 6). But, as explained in the Amendment filed on April 4, 2007, on Page 5, the elements in Menninger are not under development. For example, Menninger at ¶ 1858 allows a user to select checkboxes (FIG. 167), press a button (FIG. 168) and select items from a drop-down list (FIG. 169). However, the GUI of Menninger is provided merely to allow users to interact with already developed GUI elements (e.g. checkboxes, button, drop-down list), not form elements that are themselves under development as claimed. None of the other cited prior art remedy the deficiencies of Menninger. Therefore, none of Menninger, Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the first portion of claim 9.

Consider a second portion of claim 9, which recites in part:

retrieving a permission list from a lookup table using an identifier associated with the user, the permission list identifying access rights for developing a plurality of form elements contained in the form

As stated above for claim 1, none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the second portion of claim 9. Further, Menninger fails to remedy the deficiencies Ries, Phillips, or Rivera. Therefore, none of Menninger, Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the second portion of claim 9.

Consider a third portion of claim 9, which recites in part:

the form elements including an element for global attributes of the form including the layout of the form

As stated above for claim 1, none of Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the third portion of claim 9. Further, Menninger fails to remedy the deficiencies Ries, Phillips, or Rivera. Therefore, none of Menninger, Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the third portion of claim 9.

For at least the reasons stated above none of Menninger, Ries, Phillips, or Rivera either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the elements of claim 9. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and therefore include all of the elements recited in claim 9. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 9-13 is requested.

Claim 14 Defines Additional Elements over the Cited Art

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menninger, in view of Ries, in view of Phillips, in view of Rivera, in view of Bray, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/003353) (hereinafter "Bray"). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Consider a portion of claim 14, which recites in part:

giving authorization to all electronic form elements to a first user of the electronic form; and

for each successive user of the electronic form giving authorization to all electronic form elements to the successive user that have not yet been edited.

The bolded portions are not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art. The Office cites Bray at c. 4, ll. 34-53, for disclosing the bolded portion. But, Bray discloses only locking portions of information for a distributed system so that users do not interfere with each other's information.

Id. Bray does not disclose or suggest at least "**for each successive user.**"

None of the cited prior art remedy Bray. Therefore, none of Bray, Menninger, Phillips, Rivera, or Ries either alone or in any combination disclose or suggest the elements of claim 14. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 14 is requested.

Applicant: Thomas GOERING
Serial No. 10/665,258
Response to Final Office Action mailed July 11, 2008

CONCLUSION

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-220-4200 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 8, 2008

/Gregory R. Grace/

Gregory R. Grace
Registration No. 59,733

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-1257
Tel.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201